## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

CARL E. McDONALD,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) No. 4:06CV1009 HEA
DORN SCHUFFMAN, et al.,  Defendants.	) ) )

## **ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for Court's Leave to Amend Complaint and Page Enlargement" [Doc. #13] and plaintiff's "Motion for Court's Provision of Photocopy of Plaintiff's Subsequently Filed Court Correspondence" [Doc. #14].

Plaintiff's original complaint was dismissed by this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) on January 3, 2007. Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint was received by the Court on January 5, 2007. A review of the amended complaint indicates that it suffers from the same defects and deficiencies as the original complaint and, therefore, the amended complaint would be dismissed under § 1915(e)(2)(B) for the reasons previously detailed in this Court's prior order. Therefore, plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint will be denied.

It is unclear which documents, correspondence, orders, or pleadings plaintiff would like for this Court to copy and provide to him free of charge. Without an adequate showing of a specific need for it, the Court does not intend to provide plaintiff with a free copy of the entire Court file. Because plaintiff has not adequately identified the exact documents, correspondence, orders or other pleadings he would like to have copied, the Court will deny plaintiff's motion for

copies without prejudice.

In accordance with the foregoing,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's "Motion for Court's Leave to Amend Complaint and Page Enlargement" [Doc. #13] is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's "Motion for Court's Provision of Photocopy of Plaintiff's Subsequently Filed Court Correspondence" [Doc. #14] is **DENIED**, without prejudice.

Dated this 20th day of April, 2007.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hand brand autig